

-6-

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Webber, Jr. Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove.

In particular, the Examiner relies on the following excerpt from Webber to show applicant's claimed "governing" operation in the prior art.

"In accordance with one embodiment of the invention, there is provided a method for digital automation of supply chains. In a computerized system, at least one non-ratified contract is generated for a transaction in one supply chain of the supply chains, wherein the non-ratified contract has a plurality of terms. The contract is ratified and stored as a ratified contract in a database in the computerized system. If a term of the plurality of terms in the ratified contract indicates that at least one next contract is necessary for a next transaction in the supply chain, the above steps are repeated for the at least one next contract, and links between the ratified contract and the next contract are stored in the database." (col. 5, lines 4-15)

"In the preferred embodiment, the CAP and computing module utilize available secure socket layer protocols and public key encryption technology, such as that available from RSA Data security. A commercially available firewall advantageously protects and verifies a customer identifier associated with the customer, a bank identifier associated with the bank, and passwords." (col. 8, lines 59-65)

Applicant emphasizes that nowhere in such excerpt or elsewhere in Webber is there disclosed, taught or suggested the operation of "governing a security-related interaction between a plurality of components of the system utilizing the criteria of the contract, the components including an intrusion detection module which is subject to the governing" (emphasis added).

Webber teaches a system for governing *commercial* transactions among parties utilizing contracts. The only mention of any security-related components is in passing, as a suggestion of components that may be used to supplement the

NAI1P002/00.056.01

- 6 -

-7-

system, not for the purpose of the security-related components themselves to be governed by a contract.

Only applicant teaches and claims governing a security-related interaction between a plurality of components based on a contract. Moreover, nowhere in the prior art is there an intrusion detection module which is subject to such contract-based governing.

To reject applicant's improvements in the field of security systems in view of the *non-analogous art* of commercial supply-chain transaction control systems would not only be improper, but would also frustrate the inventive concepts of applicant. More importantly, simply nowhere in the prior art, including Webber, is there disclosed, taught or suggested the specifics of applicant's claims, as outlined above.

It should be further noted that Claim 21 has been amended and Claims 22 and 23 have been added to further emphasize this distinction. Specifically, further claimed is a combination of specific components including a plurality of intrusion detection modules, and at least one firewall. Moreover, the determining and adapting operations are performed by an analysis module. The analysis module receives information in the form of generalized intrusion detection objects for the purpose of adapting the security-related interaction between the components of the system upon the criteria of the contract not being met. Simply nowhere in the prior art is there such a combination of features and components for fulfilling the foregoing objectives. A notice of allowance or a specific showing in the prior art is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has continued by rejecting Claims 5 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber, Jr., as applied above, and further in view of Bigus. By virtue of the dependence of such claims on the independent claims discussed hereinabove, such claims are deemed allowable along with the remaining pending dependent claims.

NAI1P002/00.056.01

- 7 -

-8-

An allowance is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P002/00.056.01).

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172
Telephone: (408) 505-5100

NAI1P002/00.056.01

- 8 -